

SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/07/27 : CIA-RDP83-00442R000100090026-2

Office Memorandum ~~YES ONLY~~ UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Assistant Director for Operations

DATE: 30 December 1955

FROM : Chief, Foreign Documents Division

SUBJECT: Inspector General's Survey of FDD

Following are impressions of subject survey. All these notations are from casual impressions only and none are documented.

1. It appeared to us that members of the team entered into their examinations with preconceived ideas, some of which were dispelled before the conclusion of the survey. Some time was consumed in some instances, however, in searching for evidence which could support preconceptions rather than a deeper search into the operations. An example of this is shown in the recommendation that the branch chiefs or their deputies read and appraise all reports and initial each item. This practice is possibly done in the substantive offices where finished intelligence reports would call for such procedures. The IG team chief was shown that this practice would be burdensome with the large volume of reports and items incident to raw information reporting and that a trial by FDD had proven its undesirability.

2. The team members were poor listeners. The same question in many instances was asked again and again over a period of days. On some occasions such questions were answered in written reports furnished by the Division and team members querying on the point had to be reminded several times where the answer could be found.

3. The method of approach seemed to us to be unsystematic. No apparent schedule was followed in examining the various aspects of FDD operations. The team was briefed on 15 September on the mission, functions, and services of FDD. Questions concerning these subjects were posed as late as 14 October by the team. The Far East Branch was examined on 21 and 23 September and not again until 5 October. The first two sessions were with the branch chief, the third was with four of the section chiefs. The Scientific and Technical Branch was started by [REDACTED] on 20 September. Continuation on 28 September was carried on by [REDACTED]. The third and final session was on 11 October.

4. We do not feel that sufficient time was spent on the survey to have developed complete information. The total time in FDD amounted to 79 1/2 hours. For two men this totals less than one week. A room with telephone was provided for the team in the expectation that they would be fairly continuously conducting their examinations on the

25X1A

25X1A

SECRET

~~YES ONLY~~

SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/07/27 : CIA-RDP83-00442R000100090026-2

SUBJECT: Inspector General's Survey of FDD

premises. This room was used only a couple of hours as far as we are aware. From 15 September until 24 October members would come out to FDD for a half hour to several hours. Each time these trips were made an hour had to be consumed in transportation to and from Administration Building. Eight hours were spent with the Division Chief and the Deputy Chief, three hours in the Administrative Staff, 18 3/4 hours in Reports Branch, only 6 hours in USSR Branch, 6 1/2 hours in Eastern Europe Branch, 5 1/4 hours in Far East Branch, and 17 hours in Western World Branch. Branch chiefs in several of the branches were disappointed that the examinations were very general and did not get into the heart of the operations.

5. Numerous division records were furnished the team at their request. These included a number of working files which were needed for operations. This fact was indicated to the team members, but it was several months before all working files were returned. It was disappointing that a good deal of the information furnished the team was apparently not used in drafting the final report. An example of this appears in Recommendation "H" of the survey. [REDACTED]

25X1A

25X1A

[REDACTED] were shown the security survey of the Proprietary Project and told on several occasions of the continued discreet surveillance of the Project by the Office of Security. It was carefully explained to both these gentlemen that the audits also included examinations of the security of the Project. In spite of this a survey by the Office of Security is recommended. All points in Recommendation "H" were reviewed with these gentlemen in detail and it was shown them that the calculated risks of such an enterprise had been reduced to and kept at a minimum.

25X1A

6. [REDACTED] attitude toward some phases of the operation seemed at times to be supercilious. The loss of one member of the team doubtlessly left a good deal more work on the other two and perhaps this had some bearing on this, but he appeared to be more interested in asking questions of his own than in being thoroughly briefed by those he was interviewing.

7. A good deal of time was used in preparing graphic and memoranda material on ancillary phases, such as a complex chart showing where our source material was coming from, because "the Director liked that sort of thing." This seemed to be more window dressing and unfruitful in a survey of this type.

8. Another somewhat disappointing feature of the final report was the fact that apparently in no case was anything found which was performed in better than an average or merely satisfactory manner. This might be true but if so it is far below the standards established for our operations.

SECRET

SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/07/27 : CIA-RDP83-00442R000100090026-2

~~TOP SECRET~~

SUBJECT: Inspector General's Survey of FDD

9. As stated previously, the above remarks are impressions and not in the nature of complaints.

25X1A



J. J. BAGNALL

JJ